IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

CIVIL APPLICATION (REVIEW) NO. 19 OF 2005

SMT. PRABHA DILIPKUMAR PRABHU AND ANR., ...Applicants

Versus

LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER, PANAJI-GOA. ....Respondent

Shri. Ajit R. Kantak, Advocate fore the applicants.

Coram:- R.M.S. KHANDEPARKAR, J.

Date:- 9th January, 2006

P.C.

Heard. The contention of the learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the applicants is that this Court erred in arriving at the finding that the deposit of Rs.12,70,279/- was in compliance with the provisions of Order XXI, Rules 1 and 2 of C.P.C. while in fact the record speaks to the contrary and it was so even while passing the order dated 29th September, 2005 in Appeal from Order No.41/2005. The contention sought to be raised certainly does not disclose any error apparent on the face of the record for entertaining the review of the order dated 29.09.05. Even, otherwise, a perusal of the materials on record discloses that the said finding is arrived at after taking note of all the necessary factual matrix of the matter and, therefore, there is no case made out for review. The application is, accordingly, dismissed.

R.M.S. KHANDEPARKAR, J.

ssm.